



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO. .	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,303	12/30/1999	GILBERT WOLRICH	10559/133001	7635

20985 7590 05/16/2003  
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC  
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE  
SUITE 500  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MARC D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/476,303

Applicant(s)

WOLRICH et al.

Examiner

Marc Thompson

Art Unit

2142



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc Thompson

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Jeffrey Barclay (Reg. #48,950)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview May 15, 2003Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 13

Identification of prior art discussed:

General prior art of record, none by name or in detailAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant initiated interview for advancement of prosecution. Examiner noted and reported extreme/undue breadth of claimed invention and suggested specific areas of limitation clarification/elaboration for prosecution advancement. Among these areas discussed were description of receiving scheduler threads (functionality is seemingly required for invention operation) as described in Pages 29-30 of the specification (highest attention recommended in this section of the specification), determination specifics of active/completed information flows from process/thread to port assignment(s) and polling of ports and/or threads for same, explicit definitions of art specific words in use (e.g., process, thread, port, etc.), and header/lookup table usage. Commensurate TITLE and claimed invention was also suggested, including potential misspelled words in TITLE (possible typo). Applicant reported intended RCE filing with associated claim amendment requirement.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MARC THOMPSON

Examiner's signature, if required